UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/182,875	10/30/1998	MANABU HYODO	0879-0217P	2496

7590 02/12/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
P O BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040

EXAMINER
WHIPKEY, JASON T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/182,875	HYODO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason T. Whipkey	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 December 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453.O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 October 1998* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 18, 2002, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's remarks in response to the rejection of claims 1, 6, and 19, the examiner agrees that the cited teachings in the Suzuki reference show that Suzuki records only a part of the captured image when the camera is placed in the "small memory space photographing mode" (column 42, lines 45-47). However, this mode is not the only mode included in the embodiment shown in Figure 13 (column 41, line 54, through column 42, line 4).

The camera shown in Figure 13, as described in embodiment 11, also includes a non-space-saving mode. When in this mode, the camera stores the entire image but varies the compression level used for storage based on mask areas (column 30, lines 21-26, and column 31, lines 36-47). Data indicative of the mask used is stored on memory card 103 by CPU 113 using memory card controller 110 (column 32, lines 57-61).

Contrary to the applicant's assertion on lines 7-8 of page 5 of the remarks, Suzuki does include a principal subject position recorder: memory card controller 110. While the examiner agrees that Suzuki does not include a principal subject determining device, he does draw the applicant's attention to the Sakaegi reference and the original

rejection. The Sakaegi reference discloses a method and apparatus for enclosing a subject displayed in an image on a viewfinder via a touch panel.

Since the arguments regarding claims 1, 6, and 19 are unpersuasive and the claims are obvious over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi, the rejection stands.

Regarding the applicant's remarks in response to the rejection of claim 4, although the applicant argues that Maurinus fails to teach a camera wherein the recording instruction device includes a touch panel, positional information acquiring device, and the ability to record a captured image on a recording medium when the touch panel is touched, each of these features is included in the applicant's summary of Maurinus or inherently present.

The applicant notes that Maurinus teaches in column 3, lines 36-46, "The image output station also includes a display and customer interface, such as a touchscreen CRT 58 for customer viewing, manipulation and selection of their stored images or stock images. ... The image output station may also include a digital image recording device for recording the digital images ..."

The applicant's recording instruction device corresponds to Maurinus's image output station for controlling cameras, and the applicant's touch panel corresponds to touchscreen CRT 58. Since Maurinus's touchscreen CRT 58 is the customer's interface for "viewing, manipulation and selection" of images and the interface allows customers to record images to a recording medium, it is inherent that customers must use the touchscreen CRT 58 to request the recording. Also note column 4, lines 56-63, and column 5, lines 6-7, of Maurinus.

Since the argument regarding claim 4 is unpersuasive and the claim is obvious over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi and further in view of Maurinus, the rejection stands.

Regarding the applicant's remarks in response to the rejection of claim 5, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The examiner agrees with the applicant when he argues that Sakaegi does not teach the selection of an area using a *touch panel*. However, this limitation can be found in Suzuki.

Additionally, as stated in column 3, lines 35-36, of Sakaegi, system controller 7 performs overall control of the system, including receiving motion detection information from motion detection unit 6, as shown in Figure 1. As stated in the first Office Action, although Sakaegi does not specifically state that system controller 6 detects a closed figure, it is inherent that it does, since only a closed figure can define an area.

Since the argument regarding claim 5 is unpersuasive and the claim is obvious over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi, the rejection stands.

The examiner understands the applicant's argument in response to the rejection of claims 10 and 18. However, the examiner's view of the inherency of performing image reduction is different than the applicant's.

Column 4, lines 32-33, of Kaji state that the invention includes "an enlargement magnification setting device for setting an enlargement magnification." If the user sets

the magnification of the image at 3x, for example, and then sets the magnification to 2x, the camera reduces the image relative to its previous magnification. As shown in Figure 2, the camera constantly checks the enlargement setting to update the display accordingly. Since the magnification amount is variable, the camera permits the expansion and reduction of the captured image.

Since the argument regarding claims 10 and 18 is unpersuasive and the claims are obvious over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi and further in view of Kaji, the rejection stands.

Regarding the applicant's remarks in response to the rejection of claim 12, the examiner disagrees with the applicant's interpretation of Sarbadhikari.

First, Sarbadhikari teaches in column 10, line 64, through column 11, line 3:

> Alternatively, while a single image may be inserted, the framing of the image in the viewfinder relative to the overlay need not be in one-to-one correspondence between the captured image and the displayed image. That is, the captured image may be reduced so that the whole captured image is visible in the display through the overlay.

The examiner is not directly using this alternative embodiment as a ground for rejection. However, the use of the term "alternatively" indicates that the primary embodiment used in Sarbadhikari's teachings does not reduce the entire user-captured image to fit in the templates shown in figures 8 and 9. Rather, as stated in column 10, lines 39-43, "The camera may prompt the user to frame the image appropriately with cues in the electronic viewfinder 29, as shown in Figure 9. An outline of the template might appear in the viewfinder 29 to assist with framing." Digital processor 22 then inserts the user-captured image into the overlay (column 10, lines 33-36).

Since the argument regarding claim 12 is unpersuasive and the claim is obvious over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi and further in view of Sarbadhikari, the rejection stands.

Regarding the applicant's remarks in response to the rejection of claims 13 and 16, the examiner disagrees with the assertion that Shiota does not teach using principal subject positional information to perform image tone correction.

In the paragraph cited by the applicant, Shiota teaches that information about a principal subject (i.e., the focus target) can accompany image data so that the image may be corrected for printing. While this information may not be extensive, it is sufficiently detailed as to allow the printer to extract a main object (column 5, lines 4-7).

The general teaching from Shiota that the examiner relied upon in formulating the rejection is that information about the position of the main subject in an image may accompany that image and be used by a printer to correct the tone of an image. Since Suzuki stores data about the position of the main subject of an image with the image data itself, as described in the above treatment of claim 1, the examiner believes it would have been obvious to use Suzuki's image printing apparatus with Shiota's camera. The examiner draws this conclusion by combining the *teachings* of the prior art and not the *embodiments*. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); *In re Sneed*, 710 F.2d 1544, 1550, 218 USPQ 385, 389 (Fed. Cir. 1983); and *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973).

Since the argument regarding claims 13 and 16 is unpersuasive and the claims are obvious over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi and further in view of Shiota, the rejection stands.

2. **The applicant has failed to address the rejection of independent claim 15.** Neglect of the responsibility to address the rejection of each claim in future correspondence from the applicant may result in said correspondence being held non-responsive.

Specification

3. The amendment to the specification is approved and the corresponding objection withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The amendment to claim 4 is approved and the corresponding rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi.

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Suzuki discloses a digital still video camera that records a captured image on a memory card 103 (Figure 13). A lens unit 104 directs light onto CCD 105. The camera is instructed to take a photograph using a shutter button (column 32, line 46-47). Monitor unit 102 shows a photographed image (column 10, lines 31-32). In order to determine the subject of photography, an image mask is displayed on LCD 119 (column 32, lines 34-45). The unmasked area is used as the main subject. The masks may be defined by the user (column 34, lines 5-50). The camera stores the entire image but varies the compression level used for storage based on mask areas (column 30, lines 21-26, and column 31, lines 36-47). Data indicative of the mask used is stored on memory card 103 by CPU 113 using memory card controller 110 (column 32, lines 57-61).

Suzuki is silent with regard to using a touch panel to define a mask.

Sakaegi discloses a method and apparatus for designating an area on a viewfinder. The user moves a cursor around a main subject to denote an area (column 5, lines 38-41). A touch panel may be used with the invention (column 7, lines 35-37). Though it is not specifically disclosed that the touch panel is placed over electronic viewfinder 19, an advantage to such an arrangement would be that user could easily trace a subject. For this reason, it would have been obvious for Sakaegi to place the touch panel on top of EVF 19.

An advantage to using Sakaegi's subject-defining means is that it allows the user to generate a mask based on the actual image data, rather than having to place the subject within a mask. This makes the masking operation more accurate. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have Suzuki's camera include Sakaegi's subject-defining means.

Regarding claims 2, 3, and 7-9, only the image information defined by the cut-out subject area is provided to auto-exposure circuit 11, auto white-balancing circuit 13, and focus-detecting circuit 14 (column 5, lines 60-64). The advantage to using an area defined as a main subject to control AE, AWB, and AF is that it allows the user to ensure that the main subject is focused and properly exposed. For this reason, it would have been obvious for Suzuki's camera to base AE, AWB, and AF on the image of a main subject area.

Regarding claims 5 and 11, system controller 7 controls the overall system (column 3, lines 35-36). While not specifically stated, it is inherent that Sakaegi's subject-defining means detects a closed figure, as only a closed figure can be

considered a valid subject-defining area — a figure that is not closed does cannot define an area. A defined area is shown in Figure 2C. A circle is depicted by controller 7 to show the defined area (column 5, lines 54-55). This area is the main subject area, and is used in the AE, AF, and AWB processing described above.

Regarding claim 19, Suzuki discloses a digital still video camera that records a captured image on a memory card 103. A lens unit 104 directs light onto CCD 105. The camera is instructed to take a photograph using a shutter button (column 42, line 62). Monitor unit 102 shows a photographed image (column 10, lines 31-32). In order to determine the subject of photography, an image mask is placed over the image displayed on LCD 119 (column 42, lines 51-57). The unmasked area is used as the main subject. The masks may be defined by the user (column 43, lines 25-33). The image data and the mask used are recorded on the memory card 103.

Suzuki is silent with regard to using a pointing device to define a mask.

Sakaegi discloses a method and apparatus for designating an area on a viewfinder. The user moves a cursor around a main subject to denote an area (column 5, lines 38-41). A mouse may be used with the invention (column 7, line 35).

An advantage to using Sakaegi's subject-defining means is that it allows the user to generate a mask based on the actual image data, rather than having to place the subject within a mask. This makes the masking operation more accurate. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have Suzuki's camera include Sakaegi's subject-defining means.

Regarding claim 20, Sakaegi teaches that the user moves a cursor around a main subject to denote an area (column 5, lines 38-41). This area may be selected when the "user wishes to move the focus point and an exposure point" (column 4, lines 12-14).

8. Claims 4 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi and further in view of Maurinus.

Both claims may be treated like claim 1. However, both Suzuki and Sakaegi are silent with regard to using a touch panel to direct to instruct the camera to record an image.

Maurinus discloses an electronic photography system. When a captured image is displayed to a user on a touchscreen CRT 58, the user may manipulate and select an image to be recorded on a magnetic or optical digital storage medium (column 3, lines 35-45). The advantage to using a touchscreen to initiate recording is that it simplifies the user interface, allowing for the elimination of a shutter button. For this reason, it would have been obvious for the cameras described by Suzuki and Sakaegi to record a captured image on a recording medium using a touchscreen.

9. Claims 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Sakegi and further in view of Kaji.

Claim 10 may be treated like claim 6. However, both Suzuki and Sakaegi are silent with regard to expanding and reducing an image captured about a reference point.

Kaji discloses an image pickup apparatus. A user may enlarge an image displayed on electronic viewfinder 12 using an enlargement execution switch 8 (column 4, lines 18-20). The position of the enlargement is variable (column 4, lines 22-24). The enlargement amount is also variable (column 4, lines 32-33). If an image may be enlarged, it is inherent that the image may then be reduced. The advantage to reducing and enlarging a captured image about a reference point is that the user may view the details of a captured image to decide if the image is adequate while ignoring those parts of the image not relevant. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have the cameras described by Suzuki and Sakaegi enlarge and reduce a captured image on the display about the main subject area.

Regarding claim 18, Suzuki discloses a camera as described in the rejection of claim 1. However, both Suzuki and Sakaegi are silent with regard to using a display with an image processor for expanding or reducing an image.

Kaji discloses an image pickup apparatus. A user may enlarge an image displayed on electronic viewfinder 12 using an enlargement execution switch 8 (column 4, lines 18-20). The position of the enlargement is variable (column 4, lines 22-24). The enlargement amount is also variable (column 4, lines 32-33). If an image may be enlarged, it is inherent that the image may then be reduced. The advantage to reducing and enlarging a captured image about a reference point is that the user may view the

details of a captured image to decide if the image is adequate while ignoring those parts of the image not relevant. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have a display connected to the cameras described by Suzuki and Sakaegi enlarge and reduce a captured image on the display about the main subject area.

10. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi and further in view of Sarbadhikari.

Claim 12 may be treated like claim 11. However, both Suzuki and Sakaegi are silent with regard to storing templates and using them with a composed image.

Sarbadhikari discloses an imaging system that includes a variety of templates on storage device 24 (column 10, lines 24-28). Digital processor 22 inserts the captured image into the template (column 10, lines 33-36). Only a section of the image may be used with the template, as defined by the user (column 10, lines 39-41). The advantage to surrounding a defined main subject area with a template is that little or no processing is necessary outside the camera to enhance the image. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have Suzuki's and Sakaegi's systems include image templates for use with the defined main subject area.

11. Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi and further in view of Shiota.

Regarding claim 13, Suzuki discloses a camera as described in the rejection of claim 1. The camera also has a printer 301 that may be connected to the camera.

However, both Suzuki and Sakaegi are silent with regard to using a printer with an image processor for correcting image tone.

Shiota discloses an image reproduction system. Images captured by digital camera 1 are transferred via image server 2 to image reproducing apparatus 3. The recorded information accompanying the images may include a designation of the main subject of the image (column 5, lines 1-7). Image reproducing apparatus 3 has a set-up processing unit 11, which processes the image according to the recorded information accompanying the images (column 5, lines 50-54). This processing may include tone or color correction (column 2, lines 46-50). The final image is printed on printer 12.

An advantage to having a printer process color tone correction is that the colors may be corrected based on the printer's known ink attributes, resulting in a better-adjusted print. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have the cameras described by Suzuki and Sakaegi perform color correction in a connected printer rather than in the camera.

Regarding claim 16, Suzuki discloses a camera as described in the rejection of claim 1. However, both Suzuki and Sakaegi are silent with regard to using a display with an image processor for correcting image tone.

Shiota discloses an image reproduction system. Images captured by digital camera 1 are transferred via image server 2 to image reproducing apparatus 3. The recorded information accompanying the images may include a designation of the main subject of the image (column 5, lines 1-7). Image reproducing apparatus 3 has a set-up processing unit 11, which processes the image according to the recorded information

accompanying the images (column 5, lines 50-54). This processing may include tone or color correction (column 2, lines 46-50). The final image is displayed on display interface 13.

An advantage to having a display process color tone correction is that the colors may be corrected based on the display's color reproduction characteristics, resulting in a better-adjusted display image. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have the cameras described by Suzuki and Sakaegi perform color correction in a connected display rather than in the camera.

12. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi, further in view of Shiota, and further in view of Nagasaki.

Claim 14 may be treated like claim 13. However, Suzuki, Sakaegi, and Shiota are all silent with regard to using a printer than can reduce and enlarge an image about a reference point.

Nagasaki discloses a printer and camera combination. As shown in Figure 16, the camera enlarges an area around a specific point of a source image 85 to produce an enlarged print 86. CPU 101 performs image processing and zooming (column 8, lines 18-26).

Nagasaki is silent with regard to performing an image reduction operation before printing. However, an advantage to performing a reduction operation is that an image

may be produced that meets the size needs of a user. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have Nagasaki's printer reduce an image.

The advantage to having a printer print a reduced or enlarged image around a reference point the user can ensure the subject of an image remains in a print that is resized to meet his or her needs. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have Shiota's printer use its supplied main-subject designation to create a reduced or enlarged print.

Regarding claim 15, Suzuki discloses a camera as described in the rejection of claim 1. The camera also has a printer 301 that may be connected to the camera. However, both Suzuki and Sakaegi are silent with regard to using a printer with an image processor for expanding and reducing the supplied image.

Shiota discloses an image reproduction system. Images captured by digital camera 1 are transferred via image server 2 to image reproducing apparatus 3. The recorded information accompanying the images may include a designation of the main subject of the image (column 5, lines 1-7). Image reproducing apparatus 3 has a set-up processing unit 11, which processes the image according to the recorded information accompanying the images (column 5, lines 50-54). The final image is printed on printer 12.

An advantage to having a printer perform image processing is that the processor will better adjust the image to match the attributes of the printer. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have Suzuki's camera process images to be printed in the printer.

Suzuki, Sakaegi, and Shiota are all silent with regard to printing an expanded or reduced image.

Nagasaki discloses a printer and camera combination. As shown in Figure 16, the camera enlarges an area around a specific point from a source image 85 to produce an enlarged print 86. CPU 101 performs image processing and zooming (column 8, lines 18-26).

Nagasaki is silent with regard to performing an image reduction operation before printing. However, an advantage to performing a reduction operation is that an image may be produced that meets the size needs of a user. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have Nagasaki's printer reduce an image.

The advantage to having a printer print a reduced or enlarged image around a reference point the user can ensure the subject of an image remains in a print that is resized to meet his or her needs. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have Shiota's printer use its supplied main-subject designation to create a reduced or enlarged print.

13. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Sakaegi and further in view of Shiota and further in view of Arita.

Claim 17 may be treated like claim 16. However, Shiota is silent with regard to the display means displaying an expanded or reduced image.

Arita discloses a display means 10 connected to a camera. To perform electronic zooming, captured image data are read from RAM 7 (column 5, lines 12-22).

This data is extracted from specified coordinates of the source image stored in RAM 7, depending on the amount of zooming requested by the user (column 3, lines 9-12). If an image may be expanded on display means 10, it is inherent that it may then be reduced to restore it to its original size.

The advantage to reducing and enlarging a captured image about a reference point is that the user may view the details of a captured image to decide if the image is adequate while ignoring those parts of the image not relevant. For this reason, it would have been obvious to have the display means disclosed by Shiota enlarge and reduce a captured image on the display about the main subject area supplied to it by the camera.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason T. Whipkey, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1819. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. eastern daylight time, alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R. Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for both regular communication and After Final communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office, whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to (703) 872-9314 for either formal or informal communications intended for entry. (For informal or draft communications, please label **"PROPOSED"** or **"DRAFT"**.)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the sixth floor receptionist of Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive in Arlington, Virginia.

JTW

JTW
February 10, 2003

WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600